

United States Patent and Trademark Office

H-A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,612	11/12/2003	Jorn Maeritz	10808/112	5872
48581	7590 07/25/2006		EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE			SCHILLINGER, LAURA M	
INFINEON PO BOX 103	395		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO,			2813	
			DATE MAILED, 07/25/2004	c

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. '		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/706,612	MAERITZ, JORN		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Laura M. Schillinger	2813		
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHICH - Extens after SI - If NO p - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timus will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ARANDONE.	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35.U.S.C. 8.133)		
Status					
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 Ma</u>	arch 2006.			
_	2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This action is non-final.				
3)□ 5	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E				
Dispositio	n of Claims				
5)□ 0 6)⊠ 0 7)□ 0	Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application. a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-11</u> is/are withdrawn Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	from consideration.			
Applicatio		•			
	he specification is objected to by the Examiner	_			
	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		- - - - - -		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	-	• •		
	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa				
Priority un	ider 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)⊠ 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureause the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachment(s	s) of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO.413)		
2) Notice	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite		
	ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P. 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)		

Art Unit: 2813

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bone ('309).

Bone teaches the following claimed limitations as cited below:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for the monitoring of a manufacturing process of a plurality of physical objects, said method comprising the steps of:

performing an analysis by using values of at least one process parameter of the manufacturing process of a plurality of physical objects (Col.5, lines: 10-30 and Col.6, lines: 30-45); determining one physical object from the plurality of physical objections which best characterizes the plurality of physical objects, based on the analysis of the at least one process parameter (Col.8, lines: 5-15); and

Art Unit: 2813

selecting the one physical object which best characterizes the plurality of physical objects, for monitoring the manufacturing process (Col.8, lines: 5-15).

- 2. (Original) The method as claimed in claim 1, in which the physical object is a wafer (Col.6, lines: 10-20).
- 3.(Original) The method as claimed in claim 1 or 2, in which the analysis is a statistical analysis (Col.7, lines: 1-25).
- 4. (Original) The method as claimed in one of claims 1 to 3, in which the values of the at least one process parameter are measured when the physical object is being manufactured (Col.6, lines: 30-45).
- 5. (Original) The method as claimed in one of claims 1 to 4, in which the physical objects of the random sample are subjected to a quality checking measurement for checking the quality of the respective physical object. (Col.6, lines: 55-65)
- 6. (Original) The method as claimed in claim 5, in which, for ascertaining the variation of the qualities of the physical objects, a physical object for which the value of the at least one process parameter has a prescribed difference from the random sample is additionally subjected to a quality checking measurement (Col.6, lines: 55-65).

Application/Control Number: 10/706,612

Art Unit: 2813

7. The method as claimed in claim 1 or 6, in which the statistical analysis comprises the ascertainment of the median of the values of the at least one process parameter (Col.9, lines: 1-15- the median mean values would be the ideal processing conditions (threshold value), error values are compared against to determine whether outside deadband).

8. (Original) The method as claimed in claim 1 or 7, in which the statistical analysis comprises the ascertainment of the arithmetic mean value of the values of the at least one process parameter (Col.9, lines: 1-15- the median mean values would be the ideal processing conditions (threshold value), error values are compared against to determine whether outside deadband).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/23/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Bone fails to teach determining one physical object from the plurality of physical objects (based upon a processing parameter) and selecting the one physical object for monitoring the manufacturing process. This argument is not persuasive because Bone teaches on Col.8, lines: 5-15 that a child lot is formed to undergo subsequent testing when an processing error is detected. The child lot is formed when a batch of wafers undergoes incorrect processing as described in Col.7. The child lot is formed by selecting individual wafers from the batch, which was incorrectly processed. Thus Bone teaches precisely determining one physical object (wafer) from the plurality of physical objects (wafer batch), which is tested to monitor the manufacturing process. Bone merely teaches this determination and selecting steps are **repeated**

to form a child lot to be tested. But the formation of this child lot requires a determination that the wafer selected is the best to be selected into the child lot.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura M. Schillinger whose telephone number is (571) 272-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T, R-F 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl W. Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,612

Art Unit: 2813

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

09/15/05

Laura M Schillinger Primary Examiner Art Unit 2813